examination, and then something similar to the clause you have for examination during trial.

DELEGATE ADKINS: I must admit I am at a loss to see the point the Chair is making, but I am sure it is valid, so I will withdraw the amendment until I can reconsider it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not necessarily. The Chair's interpretation was that the clause as amended would read, to be confronted with the witnesses against him, and -- I'm sorry, to be confronted with and to examine under oath or affirmation the witnesses against him; and since the confrontation clause has always been construed to mean in trial, I suggest to you that the examination under oath would likewise be limited to examination in trial.

DELEGATE ADKINS: Without intending a lengthy debate, would it not follow from this clause that if the pre-trial deposition were offered at the trial, it would not be admissible unless at the time it were taken the witness had been subject to cross-examination?

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that is true without the amendment: The confrontation clause protects --